

REGULAR MEETING AND PUBLIC HEARING
OF THE FALLS CHURCH PLANNING COMMISSION
April 20, 2009
Council Chamber

1. CALL TO ORDER: Chair Lawrence called the meeting to order at 7:48 p.m.

2. ROLL CALL:

Members Present: Ms. Hockenberry
Mr. Lawrence
Mr. Meeks
Ms. Rodgers
Ms. Teates
Mr. Wodiska

Member Absent: Mr. Kearney

Administrative Staff Present: Ms. Cotellessa, General
Manager of Development
Services and Planning
Director
Ms. Block Sanford,
Principal Planner

Chair Lawrence informed the commissioners that Mr. Kearney would not be attending tonight's meeting regarding BJ's; because of former employment he's not allowed to take part in it but would be here for the worksession afterwards.

3. ADOPTION OF AGENDA: Ms. Teates moved, and Ms. Hockenberry seconded, to adopt the agenda as presented.

Upon voice vote, the motion passed unanimously.

4. PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS:

Ms. Teates attended the recent EDA meeting on April 14, a presentation by Dr. Gerald Gordon, the president and CEO of the Fairfax County EDA. There was discussion about how they worked to bring businesses into Fairfax County, specifically how they brought Hilton and Volkswagen in. Since Volkswagen came in, they were getting informational hits from other European companies. Dr. Gordon also talked about how Falls Church should be taking advantage of what Fairfax County was doing and when Falls Church looks at itself, it should be looking to sell itself as a region.

Dr. Gordon pointed out on average every resident was going to cost more tax dollars than would be received from a resident and all municipalities are run off commercial dollars. Now that Falls Church is built up with a greater population, it needs to look at commercial dollars for the long term. Ms. Teates noted Dr. Gordon was very informative and provided different strategies that Fairfax County had tried.

MINUTES OF THE 20 APRIL 2009 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED 18 MAY 2009

Ms. Teates noted further the EDA was looking to put in place a contact with Jim Snyder, someone who works for Arlington County, to do some vision planning working with students at Virginia Tech Planning School in Alexandria, about things to do in East Falls Church. For example, now that BJ's was going in, how to build on that and other commercial properties that had opened up. Ms. Teates thought since the Comp Plan rewrite was coming up, this might be something to emphasize.

Ms. Rodgers was at the Recreation and Parks meeting earlier in the month and she reported the Farmers Market would open for the summer on May 2nd and there was a waiting list for spots. The West End Park preliminary site plan had been developed and would be coming to the Planning Commission soon. She proclaimed it a wonderful but ambitious planning document.

Ms. Rodgers further reported that Hamlet Master plan was also in the works and there was talk about possible daylighting of the stream, which she thought very encouraging. The ZOAC Committee was still plowing through hundreds of pages of the document and she thought there would be a lot of changes before it comes to the Planning Commission. Currently they were on the second installment. The first installment had been sent back and they hadn't received anything back with their comments.

Ms. Hockenberry suggested the City's web site should contain information about ZOAC. Ms. Rodgers said there was no current information ready but they could report that they were still working on it.

Ms. Hockenberry reported the Arts and Cultural Task Force was meeting tomorrow night, Tuesday, April 21, 2009, to hear about different cultural zoning areas. In May or June there would be a field trip down to Fredricksburg.

Ms. Hockenberry further related The Branding Task Force was doing different focus groups at this point in time and was getting non-residents' perspectives as well as people who live here.

As Ms. Hockenberry had mentioned before, the 7th grade students' survey regarding the corner of Pennsylvania and Broad was going to be presented to the CACT. She reported they did a great PowerPoint and turned it into a very interesting project.

Mr. Wodiska attended the CATC meeting on April 11th. It was a relatively short meeting where the South Oak Street traffic calming petition was reviewed. After a very formal and exhaustive process, it did not get passed. There is a requirement of 75 percent support for it and it just missed that level; therefore the CACT did not pass on a recommendation to the City Manager to make any adjustments. He believed there would be a stop sign added but that is not considered a traffic calming matter.

Mr. Lawrence reported The Library Board of Trustees met last week and the good news was the City Council was moving forward, taking \$2 million from the City Hall money and CAP and putting it toward the library in 2010. The City Council has basically agreed to have it as a separate line item at \$2 million but for the year 2011. He thanked everyone for all their support and good ideas.

5. RECEIPT OF PETITIONS: None.

MINUTES OF THE 20 APRIL 2009 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED 18 MAY 2009

6. PLANNING DIRECTOR'S REPORT/WORKSESSION SCHEDULE:

Ms. Cotellessa reported there were two items on the agenda this evening: A subdivision and site plan for BJ's on Wilson Boulevard, a by-right site plan action which meant this was essentially an administrative act. The Planning Commission would be reviewing the site plan for conformance with the City's regulations, to determine if it does meet the regulations, and they would be looking at both preliminary and final this evening.

The second part of this evening's agenda was a worksession regarding the Palladium Project on North Lee Street and Park. It was sent down by the City Council for a strong look at several aspects of the project before it comes back to City Council and goes through the rezoning process.

Ms. Cotellessa noted the City Council was in the final throws of their budget. They pulled out the \$2 million as a separate line item which they would be discussing this evening and next week as well. They made a move to pull an additional \$1 million out of the combined City Hall/Public Safety/Library for a parks issue, combination of Parks Master Planning and improvements in a couple of parks. Two additional line items would be expected to be pulled out of that, both in 2011.

Master Plans were being done on some of the City's parks and the Planning Commission had been part of subdivision actions in several regarding the park system by purchase. An overall item regarding 5 or 6 pieces of land would be coming forward to the Planning Commission to do a comprehensive plan amendment to look at the future land use plan for parks because they were originally zoned and planned residential.

As Ms. Rodgers said, they were working hard on the ZOAC, the committee and the staff. The original drafts were to be staff review drafts. They were trying to make sure they've done as much as possible to be ready for public release so there wouldn't be glaring issues.

Chair Lawrence asked about the ZOAC schedule and Ms. Cotellessa said it was not on the schedule for May 4th which she would discuss with Chair Lawrence later.

7. OLD BUSINESS: None.

8. NEW BUSINESS:

A. **Subdivision (Consolidation) for BJ's Wholesale Club, 6607 Wilson Boulevard
Preliminary and Final Approval**

B. **Site Plan for BJ's Wholesale Club, 6607 Wilson Boulevard
Preliminary and Final Approval**

Ms. Wendy Block Sanford presented the staff report for BJ's Wholesale Club.

The JBG Company submitted a site plan and subdivision application on behalf of BJ's Wholesale Club for the property located at 6607 Wilson Boulevard. The total site is 8.6 acres and contains three lots with the same RPC number. The applicant seeks

MINUTES OF THE 20 APRIL 2009 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED 18 MAY 2009

Page 3

to consolidate the three lots and construct a new by-right commercial development of BJ's Wholesale Club on the property. The development would contain just over 89,000 square feet of space which includes a retail store and a tire center. There is also a propane tank refilling station located in the parking lot.

The site includes 359 parking spaces in a ground level surface parking lot in front of the building. The site plan parcels are zoned M-1, light industrial, and designated as business on the adopted Future Land Use Map. The M-1 zoning district permits B-3 general uses by right.

This is the applicant's third submission of the site plan and subdivision and the applicant met with the Planning Commission in a worksession on March 30. The applicant is now seeking preliminary and final approval of both the site plan and the subdivision from the Planning Commission this evening.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the site plan and subdivision and final administrative approval be granted by the Planning Director upon resolution of the 23 remaining technical items listed in the staff report.

In terms of Comprehensive Plan compatibility, the staff finds the project does reflect compliance with the Comp Plan. The Comp Plan Future Land Use Map identifies the designation for this property as business and as envisioned by the Comprehensive Plan this project will be commercial in character and would contain a single retail use.

In terms of the design guidelines, staff finds that the project meets the design guidelines outlined in the Comp Plan for this site. One of the design guidelines is that this project encourages development that will promote a positive image of the City as part of the gateway. The site is located at the gateway to the City on Wilson Boulevard. This project will bring a new, large retail development to the City and will provide new streetscape as well as gateway signage.

Secondly, a design guideline is that the project will increase pedestrian connections to adjacent areas. This project will feature a 14 foot streetscape on Wilson Boulevard which will improve pedestrian connectivity from adjacent sites.

Third, transform large areas of surface parking to, at a minimum, have them attractively integrated with landscaping, pedestrian features, local pedestrian networks, and the use of structured parking. This site includes a large at-grade parking lot, rather than a structured parking facility, the surface parking lot provided does integrate landscaping, including the use of shade trees. The parking lot includes a pedestrian walkway from the streetscape to the main building entrance.

Staff is recommending a relocation of the pedestrian walkway.

Another design guideline to insure compatibility with development of adjacent parcels in Fairfax County and redevelopment of this site does not change the land use for the site and does not impact the County. Staff has met with Fairfax County Supervisor Penny Gross to discuss the site plan for this property.

Another design guideline is to ensure adjacent residential areas are effectively screened and buffered. This site abuts residential properties in both the City of

MINUTES OF THE 20 APRIL 2009 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED 18 MAY 2009

Page 4

Falls Church and Arlington County on the north and northeastern property lines. Applicant is providing a 30 foot wide vegetative buffer in the rear and 20 foot wide buffer on the east side of the property. The 30 foot buffer exceeds the Code requirement and will mature to provide a visual screen between the residential properties and the redeveloped site. Arlington County has commented specifically on this portion of the plan and is supportive of the proposed landscaping plans in this area.

The site plan shows a 6 foot screening fence. Ms. Block Sanford noted the site plan says "wall" and there is a fence shown near the loading area. Staff has requested that this wall extend across the entire northern side of the parking lot and it be increased in height. The taller extended wall is necessary to augment the landscape screen due to the topographic difference between the rear of the BJ's project and the adjacent residential properties which lie below that.

As to the parking analysis with regards to the site plan review, the Code requires one space for every 250 square feet of floor area. What is required by Code then is 351 parking spaces. The applicant is providing 359 parking spaces, so this meets the Code for parking.

In terms of the traffic impact review, this development was subject to the Virginia Department of Transportation Chapter 527 Traffic Impact Analysis Review because it exceeded the VDOT threshold of 250 vehicles per hour on a locally maintained street located within 3000 feet of a state maintained highway. Essentially every street in the City meets this requirement but this project triggered the 527 Review. The project was scoped with VDOT and the applicant submitted a TIA and a follow-up addendum based on initial rounds of comments. At this point VDOT has determined that the submittal meets the 527 requirements. In addition, staff also feels that the applicant has adequately addressed all of the issues raised previously in this process.

In terms of the Chesapeake Bay Preservation Ordinance, this site is located within a resource management area and as such the Chesapeake Bay Ordinance requires that each project conform to general performance criteria that evaluate the amount of land disturbance, the type and amount of vegetation being removed and replanted, and the type of best management practices being used on the site. The Ordinance states that if pre-development impervious land cover is greater than 50 percent, the post-development pollutant load shall be reduced to 90 percent of the pre-development pollutant load. In this case the applicant is reducing the post-development pollutant load of the site by 10 percent through the use of a manufactured underground best management practice which are filterstrips located throughout the site and the bioswale. In addition, the pervious area will be decreased from 85 percent to 81 percent through use of landscaping.

With regard to the site plan review, she noted the applicant was not requesting any waivers to the Code requirements and staff was pleased with the progress of the site plan and would commend BJ's on its responsiveness to staff concerns, most of which had been resolved at this point.

As to outstanding comments, staff was requesting that the applicant relocate the pedestrian walkway to the center of the parking lot currently shown on the eastern side and relocate it without reducing the amount of parking lot landscaping. Staff would support the proposed location if the drive-in to the turn aisle were shifted

approximately 80 feet north. This would create a longer vehicular cuing area at the site entrance and would create a safe crossing for pedestrians further into the site than currently shown on the site plan. Staff does not support the current walkway which puts pedestrians in conflict with vehicles when they enter the site.

Secondly, staff recommends the applicant extend the privacy fence as mentioned previously along the rear of the site and ensure that the fence structure and location are compatible with storm-sewer maintenance requirements. Staff recommends that the fence height be increased to 7 or 8 feet where appropriate and the material be changed to wood or plastic wood composite. The Code limits fences within rear yards to 7 feet, so that staff therefore recommends a 7 foot fence in areas within the rear yard and an 8 foot fence where it can be accommodated outside of the 30 foot rear yard area.

The remainder of the comments listed on pages 4 and 5 of the staff report were mostly technical and minor corrections and questions for clarification from City Staff. While Ms. Block Sanford did not go through them, she submitted they could be corrected fairly easily on the site plan.

Adjacent property owners in the City, Arlington County, and Fairfax County were notified of the public hearing. Staff received some written comments from Arlington Planning Staff after the first version of the site plan which had been addressed at this point, and had also spoken with a number of the adjacent property owners. There was one written letter included in the site plan package.

The Architectural Advisory Board met on April 1st to discuss the application. They made the motion listed on page 6. They recommended approval of the application.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission approve the site plan and subdivision and that final administrative approval be granted by the Planning Director upon resolution of the 23 technical items listed in the staff report. The motions attached as Attachment 3 all state 22 items but should be 23; and on page 3 of the staff report where it notes the "6 foot wall" is actually a privacy fence and that is what staff is recommending be extended; and a change to Condition 2, as previously noted, that the fence height where it says "also increase fence height to 7 feet," it should say "to 7 or 8 feet to comply with the Code."

Ms. Block Sanford offered to answer questions from the commissioners.

Chair Lawrence asked for the applicant's presentation before questions were posed.

Mr. Bill Baskin was present as counsel for the applicant, BJ's. On behalf of BJ's, he extended gratitude to the planning staff especially, but all of the City's staff and drew particular attention to Mr. Goff's memo, which was part of the Planning Commission's packet. Mr. Goff, the EDA Director, noted this had been an extraordinary process of cooperation and collaboration, and Mr. Baskin appreciated the efforts of the staff.

Mr. Baskin informed the planning commissioners he had met with the immediately adjoining neighbors abutting the property and had what he thought was a very cordial meeting. A number of issues were raised and BJ's responded to those where they were able to and he believed they made substantial changes to the proposal which he would highlight.

MINUTES OF THE 20 APRIL 2009 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED 18 MAY 2009

Mr. Baskin drew attention to the fact the staff report noted 23 items needed to be resolved, but he submitted 21 of those 23 items were non-issues. BJ's was in the process of making the changes to their plans which would come forward in the final submission once the plan was approved. There were really only two issues. He would be happy to discuss any issues the Planning Commission would like but in particular there were two items he wanted to address.

He related that BJ's located the walkway on the east side of the property near the entrance controlled by a traffic light. That came about in part from their meeting with the AAB. The AAB suggested that as a location for the walkway for a number of reasons that support that as being a good location. One is that it's right at a signal where there is a crosswalk for Wilson Boulevard, so pedestrians coming from the apartments across the street could come across the crosswalk and would hit BJ's pedestrian walkway and proceed directly to the front door of the building. It covers the area from the sidewalk to the front door in about the shortest route possible and it's BJ's experience that is the route most people would take, the shortest route possible. What was shown on their proposed site plan, Mr. Baskin believed was an appropriate location for the walkway.

The second item was the fence. The meeting with the neighbors spawned further examination for what BJ's had planned. They had showed a fence covering part of the expanse at the rear of the property, not all of it, and had shown a 4 or 5 foot fence initially. In meeting with the neighbors, they expressed concern about headlights and the lights spilling over onto their property from vehicles that had to access the rear of the building. In those discussions, it seemed if the size of the fence was increased and have it span the entire length of the rear, that would go a long way towards mitigating their concerns. BJ's has proposed a 6 foot fence across the entire rear of the property.

It was noted that there are storm and sanitary sewer easements at the rear of the property. If the City Public Works was willing to work with BJ's and waive that, they didn't mind putting a fence across those. If they had a concern, the City might prevent BJ's from doing that. If the fence had to be removed temporarily to make a repair, so be it. Mr. Baskin thought it would improve the desirability of BJ's presence with respect to the neighbors.

Mr. Baskin advised the commissioners the fence comes in 6 or 7 foot heights and BJ's was willing to do whatever height it comes in. It was not a custom fence but would be a finished fence. The fence would be landscaped primarily on its outside, on the neighbor's side of the fence. The fence is located between 18 and 23 feet from the rear property line inside the property line, so the majority of the landscaping added would be in that area that is outside of the fence and should screen not only the building to some degree but also the fence itself as well.

One of the other things BJ's was able to look at as a result of meeting with the neighbors was what trees they were able to save. They weren't able to go as far as they would like to but they have preserved a number of trees at the northwest corner of the property at the rear and tried to maximize that after hearing the neighbors' concerns. Because of the need to regrade the property, they're not able to save all the mature trees but BJ's would be planting significant landscaping and new landscaping that would mature. The staff has pointed out the landscaping as it matures would provide substantial screening for the project and BJ's finds that to

be acceptable as far as meeting City standards.

Mr. Baskin submitted the only other issue set forth among those 23 issues dealt with the water line. The City had requested a looped system that would be looped with the water line on Roosevelt Boulevard. What was being proposed and provided is a loop system that loops back into Wilson Boulevard. It's his understanding staff merely wants BJ's to acknowledge they've been told they think it would be better to do the loop with Roosevelt and there were some concerns about it being a system if done with Roosevelt would be less likely for interruption. As Mr. Baskin understood it, the choice was BJ's, that they provide a system that works. The loop with Wilson Boulevard does work and their position is that is satisfactory. The City's position is it's satisfactory. They'd like better but they want BJ's to acknowledge they were told by the City how they would like it and they have. BJ's would acknowledge that and would be glad to supplement that in any way the staff likes.

The last thing that Mr. Baskin noted was they were not here for rezoning. The City can take a position of negotiation. He believed they had met the requirements for the site plan and asked the Planning Commission to approve it. He noted the approval would render benefits not just to BJ's and JBG, the owner of the site, but to the City as well. As Mr. Goff pointed out in his memo, this project would bring substantial revenue to the City. It was BJ's desire to get it built as soon as possible so that revenue stream could begin and benefit everybody. Mr. Baskin looked forward to getting BJ's open in the City and being good neighbors to the surrounding community.

Mr. Baskin offered to answer any questions the commissioners had.

Mr. Wodiska noted the staff notation said to change the fence to wood or plastic/wood composite, and asked what fence material the applicant was proposing.

Mr. Baskin related the fence proposed would be a synthetic fence, either plastic or vinyl. He was not certain of the exact make up of the material. It would give the appearance of a wood fence but without the maintenance issues of a wood fence.

Mr. Wodiska also noted the AAB report mentioned the lighting on the back of the building and inquired if a 6 or 7 foot fence would do anything to mitigate the lighting on the back of the building. It was Mr. Baskin's understanding the lights on the building were shielded so that the light went down and did not spill over the property line. They had been required to meet about as strict a standard that could be imposed for light at the property line. Where they abut residential properties, they have to keep their light no more than one tenth of a foot candle 7 feet into the neighbor's property. That is the lowest he believed they could be and he thought they met that. Regarding specific concern about the northeast corner, Mr. Baskin thought the loading dock was more toward the commercial neighbors.

Ms. Block Sanford added the Code said the lighting spill over cannot be more than .1 to 1 foot candle 7 feet into the property line. Staff has interpreted that to mean adjacent to the residential properties it cannot exceed .1, and adjacent to the commercial it could go to the 1. It's the most stringent requirement that has been met adjacent to the residential properties.

Ms. Hockenberry asked Ms. Block Sanford if the fence placed over the storm sewer was all right with the City. Ms. Block Sanford replied what staff would need is to have the fence shown and have it reviewed by staff as one of the items reviewed administratively. They'd like to see the fence shown in the proposed location as close to the parking lot as possible and as high up as possible, and then they could see if there were any kind of conflicts. If there was a portion of the fence that needed to be pulled out for maintenance, alternatives could be looked at. It was difficult to know until they saw what would be proposed. They needed to make sure it didn't conflict.

Ms. Hockenberry asked why the fence needed to be 7 or 8 feet versus 6 to 7 feet tall. Ms. Block Sanford replied this was something the neighborhood requested. 7 feet is the maximum allowed by the Code within a rear yard. The neighborhood has actually requested 8 feet. So staff supports that and would like to see the 8 feet where it could be located outside of that rear yard.

Chair Lawrence asked for the definition of where a rear yard begins and ends. Ms. Sanford informed him it was from the property line in. This would be 30 feet and would be pretty tight. It was 30 feet in because of the landscaping. It's really because of the topographic differences. Landscaping is located in that buffer area so the residential properties were going to be looking at that. The fence would be located higher up, closer to where the parking lot was, which was why it created a nicer screen. You would see the landscaping and looking up you would see some retaining wall shown in some portions and above that the fence, which would shield the headlights from some of the cars. You would still see the top of the building and the roof. This would shield some of the parking lot traffic and headlights.

Chair Lawrence inquired if 8 feet would be the maximum there. Ms. Block Sanford replied the Code says 7 feet if it's in a rear yard. If it can be located outside of the rear yard, it can be 30 feet. It is only 30 feet in some areas but it widens over in areas. Where possible, where the fence would be out of the rear yard, it could exceed 7 feet in height and meet the request of the neighborhood of 8 feet.

Chair Lawrence asked if the fence couldn't be squeezed in 30 feet, would there be a variance or a waiver. Ms. Block Sanford replied if it's located within the rear yard, within that 30 feet, then it would be limited to a maximum of 7 feet. Staff recommends 7 feet at that location, otherwise it would need a variance from the BZA.

Mr. Baskin added that BJ's was fine with the 7 feet in the rear yard. If there were places it could be constructed outside of the rear yard closer to the building, they were okay with 8 feet. They wanted to avoid a situation where they were told or asked to get a variance. He thought that put a burden on BJ's that was not appropriate. If they meet the Code, they shouldn't be forced to get some variation that doesn't meet the Code. He also believed they could work within that.

Mr. Baskin also wished to mention a big concern mentioned at the meeting with the neighbors was drainage on the site. BJ's had originally proposed a drainage outlet that would accommodate a ten year storm, which was all the City required. As a result of the meeting with the neighbors, BJ's modified the plan to propose a system that would accommodate a 100 year storm.

MINUTES OF THE 20 APRIL 2009 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED 18 MAY 2009

Ms. Teates inquired if there were currently drainage issues to these properties. Ms. Block Sanford acknowledged the neighbors had informed staff there were drainage problems. By Code, the applicant is required to deal with the storm water runoff from their site. The rear buffer area would be regraded to improve the drainage. It would not alleviate all of the neighbors' problems but would not make it worse. With the changes to the grading, instead of having the water flow directly on to the properties, it would be steering it more towards the storm drain.

The Chair opened the item to the public.

Bill Brew, (936 North Quesada Street), noted while it was abundantly clear BJ's was a done deal, thought the biggest loss was a 30 yard swath of wood that runs behind all of their homes, which had lots of wildlife. A few things he wanted to stress as important was a strong concern about the lights, and a much stronger concern about sealing off the commercial property from the residential with a solid fence running the full length of the property behind the commercial and the residential property.

Regarding the landscaping buffer which would be put in once the trees were taken out, he hoped whatever trees went in were not small trees but were on their way to maturity and they would not have to wait 20 to 30 years to get some sort of screen.

He also related there was no question there were water concerns coming from the existing property. With the loss of the 30 yard swath of trees and underbrush along with Koon's overflow lot which clearly stopped some of the water when there was a storm, that would all be gone and it would be paved property. In the future if there was significant impact in terms of storm water runoff onto the property, he requested some way to come back to the table and to deal with the fact that the storm water runoff planning hadn't worked out.

Marie Davis (924 North Quesada Street) lives on one side of the storm drainage ditch. She noted she's lived there 24 years and raised children there and it was a family neighborhood. She didn't care how the fence looked as long as it was big and strong and allowed children to play in their back yards.

She expressed concern that the City may have to grant a variance or approval of having the fence across the sewer because the City owns the easement for the storm sewer. She had seen a drawing by Karen Steen of the part that would not be fenced which was in her yard and her neighbor's yard and there was a hole in the fence there. Her back yard would no longer be secure or safe if people could simply walk through from a commercial property or Seven Corners.

Drainage was her other concern. Ms. Block Sanford confirmed Ms. Davis' inquiry as to whether the City approved the 100 year drainage and Ms. Davis asked if there was a process to get approval for the City to give permission to build on that easement so that there can be a fence there to secure the properties.

Hamid Khosrovi (940 North Quesada Street) was concerned with the replacement of the large trees with small trees. The strip of land was a good buffer and there were a lot of healthy trees there and he didn't understand why they were redoing the whole thing. Another concern he had was the propane tank. He wondered why they could not place that on the Roosevelt Avenue side rather than in the back yard which was

a dangerous thing.

The last thing he wanted to mention was he had been a long time resident of Falls Church for 45 years and each time a new business comes to town citizens are told this increases the tax base, which was fine, only homeowners' taxes have never been brought down until last year because the national economy going down.

Chair Lawrence asked staff about the location of the propane tank.

Ms. Block Sanford said the tank was closer to Roosevelt Avenue but there was another property there and then Roosevelt Avenue. She indicated where on the plat the propane tank was located in the parking lot.

William Graver, (6137 9th Road, Arlington), asked which way the slope of the land was in relation to the propane tank. He was focused on the potential leaking of the tank and to ensure containment of the particular fuel so it wouldn't move down in the area of the residents. He requested a preliminary study be done just to understand better which way the slope was in trying to emulate what could occur and if it posed a hazard to sleeping residents.

Chair Lawrence responded the developer would be asked to address that after public comment.

Michael Gallagher (2914 Peyton Randolph Drive) lives in the condominiums across from the projected site and expressed concern about whether the standards for landscaping and lighting that applied to the residences across Wilson Boulevard were to the same level as applied to the residential areas behind the site. He heard a lot of talk about lighting concerns and landscaping concerns on the north and the east side of the site and asked about the south side of the site for the residents across the other side of Wilson Boulevard.

Mr. Gallagher's other concern was regarding the VDOT studies done on traffic and asked if the traffic studies took into account traffic on Peyton Randolph Drive and what were the effects of traffic on that very narrow street, especially concerning trucking that may be using that street to service the site.

Joanne Evans represented the Cavalier Club LLC at 6200 Wilson Boulevard. She wondered how BJ's would handle the big box store atmosphere so close to the residential neighborhood and what steps were being taken to protect the quality of living, such as deliveries at night, 18 wheelers, and the increased traffic when the store was open, the work hours during construction during weekdays and weekends, the construction during traffic and deliveries, and all the noise during construction.

The main thing regarding traffic on Wilson Boulevard was there is one entrance and exit off of Wilson. The traffic light would be right there with BJ's, and with all that increased traffic on Wilson Boulevard, she thought the residents wouldn't be able to get in and out at nighttime because the traffic light was so close to their entrances. Her concern was possibly having to build another driveway on McKinley which was in another county.

Gregory Butler (932 North Quesada Street), related his house was at the back of the property on the north side. The question he had was about the buffer zone and the

MINUTES OF THE 20 APRIL 2009 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED 18 MAY 2009

planting. He understood there was a one year bond to help make sure the plants take hold and continue to thrive. If something were to happen, they would be quickly replaced, but beyond that time he was curious about how the zoning applied to it.

He also asked regarding maintenance of the fence, if there were issues that came up, how a homeowner would go about requesting assistance and correcting something that wasn't the way it should be. He further requested more information about the sequence of steps involved, the timeline of the clearing of the plants, land and replanting, regrading, and construction of the fence.

Carmel Fisk (858 North Ohio Street), lives on the northeast corner of the development. She wanted to make clear when there was discussion about the fencing, it did include the back and a turn to the northeast so it was on the east side of the building. Her other concern was during construction there would be displacement of wildlife and she had a question as to precautionary steps residents could take to prevent wildlife from taking residence in their yards and homes. They would be interested in having a contact person if issues developed.

Having no other speaker slips, the Chair closed the item to the public.

Ms. Block Sanford addressed the questions from the public regarding landscaping and lighting concerns. As to Peyton Randolph Drive, the same Code requirements apply in terms of light spilling over and landscaping. It was something that Supervisor Gross brought up as well. The streetscape was as shown and the headlights from the cars would actually be buffered from the properties across the street because of the landscaping shown.

Chair Lawrence asked if on the Wilson Boulevard side the landscaping would have line of sight issues for traffic because of curb cuts. Mr. Block Sanford acknowledged that was correct. There would be lower shrubs planted where there couldn't be trees. A buffer is required by Code between the street and the parking area. The sidewalk has plantings on either side of it on the front location on Wilson Boulevard.

In terms of a traffic construction plan, maintenance of traffic plan was shown in the site plan. Staff would also be looking for a construction plan that would be separate from the site plan. That could be added as a 24th condition or noted in the minutes of this meeting. Staff would be looking for a separate construction plan showing any lane closings on Wilson Boulevard, sidewalk closings on Wilson as well, and how pedestrian and traffic would be routed during construction. It had been discussed with the applicant. It was a prerequisite to obtaining permits for the site and that would be another requirement that staff would look for on the site plan.

Regarding Mr. Butler's comments about the landscaping, Ms. Block Sanford explained the landscaping is bonded after that. It's a site plan compliance issue. The fence would be maintained by the developer. If there were any issues, staff could look into it. If they were alerted of any kind of problems, they would then contact the developer to follow up. This was all on their property and would be subject to what was shown in the site plan.

In regard to Ms. Fisk's comments about the fencing, Ms. Block Sanford informed the

commissioners staff would support that recommendation, that the fence also come around to the eastern side of the property in front of the two residences in Arlington County as well.

As far as displacement of wildlife, she deferred to the developer for a response to that question.

Ms. Block Sanford said the issue of the traffic on Peyton Randolph was looked at and was one of the primary intersections looked at. The study looked at accident rates carefully and looked at any kind of mitigation. She would defer to the traffic consultant for the site who could provide additional information.

On the construction management plan, Ms. Cotellessa noted part of that would be to identify who the on-site folks would be during construction so if neighbors had concerns they would have a phone number on site to call and a list of people to call with issues related to noise, dust, runoff, and who the appropriate people to call if there were problems. There would be signs on the site but also through the planning office and staff would be able to pass all that information on to them.

Ms. Cotellessa wished to elaborate on the landscaping bonding requirement. Falls Church has very strict requirements regarding landscaping. The one year bonding didn't even begin until after the plantings were established and had appropriate irrigation to make sure it's going to grow. After that, it becomes a site plan maintenance issue to make sure it's maintained and in good quality. The one year bond would start after the plantings were installed and fully inspected.

Mr. Baskin explained the propane tank had been relocated away from the residences and it was blocked by the building. There was no straight line from the propane fueling station to the residences without going through the building. The plans had been reviewed by the fire marshal and there are strict safety codes that regulate this as well and all issues had been addressed that BJ's been made aware of. He didn't think there were any outstanding safety issues and believed BJ's had complied with every Code requirement.

Mr. Baskin suspected part of the construction plan put together would deal with timing of the various construction activities and steps that would need to be done to mitigate whatever wildlife appeared. They would be required to put up a silt fence and a whole variety of construction issues that would be planned out and reviewed and approved by staff.

Ms. Block Sanford announced it would be appropriate then to recommend as part of the motion, that the construction plan, which would be submitted after the site plan was approved, include a mitigation plan for the wildlife, which is something that would be very particular to this project.

Mr. Baskin added as far as mitigating wildlife migration, BJ's was happy to work with the staff on that. They were a little nervous about what that might encompass and the open ended nature of it however.

Ms. Teates suggested that BJ's speak with the animal control officer and warn her of that. There are only limited places where wildlife can be released in the City and that area was one of them. Mr. Baskin reiterated they would be glad to do that.

MINUTES OF THE 20 APRIL 2009 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED 18 MAY 2009

Ms. Rodgers believed there was a requirement that rat poison be set out every so many feet at a construction site. Ms. Block Sanford said she would look into that.

Ms. Hockenberry asked about the size of the landscaping trees knowing there were certain sizes the arborist requires. Many times trees are harmed by vines and things that look big and healthy but in essence they're very often not. Since she was liaison to the tree commission, she knew that was quite often the case.

Ms. Teates remarked when she first looked at the site plan she was concerned about tree removal, but the more she's reading, the more she understands there is a drainage problem and part of regrading was that the trees had to come out or they could not regrade.

Ms. Cotellessa agreed and explained there were, in fact, some good, strong substantial trees that would be lost in this process, but there was also a great deal of scrub and undesirable trees in this area that would be taken out. The stock that would be going in would first of all meet the minimum Code standards, the strongest they can find because the City arborist does not want weak-limbed trees. When planting new in a site like this, there is a certain size tree that takes and grows well. Bigger trees don't always do as well. Small little sticks are not what they were after either. They were looking at the trees in the one and a half to 3 inch range which would be substantial, that would set well, and grow well in this site.

There would be wildlife displaced. Ms. Cotellessa submitted as we urbanize, that is what happens. To the extent it can be mitigated by working with animal control and by making sure the construction site is well managed, they would do that.

Ms. Teates noted the very large fence would need some type of access in it because they would have to get to the other side to look at the landscaping. Mr. Baskin replied the current fence was a chain link fence which he believed went all the way across.

Ms. Teates asked if it was because the proposed fence was solid that it was more of an issue going across the storm drain. Ms. Block Sanford replied it was because there would be an easement. Staff didn't want to commit before having seen the plan and the location of the fence. They want to have it reviewed by the engineering department to make sure the maintenance of the storm sewer was taken care of.

Ms. Teates commented the 7 foot fence could go in right now and there were no issues. It seemed a complication to put another foot in there and wondered if it was really necessary.

Ms. Block Sanford said it would meet the Code if it's outside of the rear yard, that was why the staff's recommendation was to keep it 7 feet within the rear yard and if it can be increased to 8, outside of it, fine. It would be tight and she wasn't sure if it could be done in many areas. The engineers would have to look and see if it could be worked out. Ms. Teates didn't want a haphazard look and Ms. Block Sanford agreed, which was why they were trying to put flexibility in the approval language to allow it to be 8 feet in some locations and where it didn't look awkward.

Chair Lawrence drew attention to the issue worked out on page 5, number 17, about the water line and the fire, and wanted to make sure that he understood that meant basically the City was concerned that if the water on Wilson gets shut down, then BJ's would have no water for fighting a fire should there be one.

Ms. Block Sanford's understanding of the comment was that if the water line in Wilson is shut down, the store will be without fire protection and domestic water. The City's Public utilities engineer was looking for acknowledgment that BJ's understands that is a liability issue for them. The engineer had requested it. The Code did not require it and they wanted BJ's to acknowledge what the repercussions were.

Chair Lawrence asked if it meant fire protection for sprinklers inside the store as opposed to an accessible hydrant with water for the fire department. Ms. Cotellessa replied that was correct. BJ's had a fire consultant look at the issue and they felt satisfied that they were well protected with a loop system going in and out of Wilson Boulevard. In trying to improve the City's water line systems, looping systems throughout the City, on every development project the utility folks were in there to get the best they can in terms of looping. In this case it required fairly extensive extension down towards Roosevelt. It's not a requirement and BJ's was opting out of it, having been satisfied with their fire consultant that it's not necessarily. The fire department wouldn't have problems getting lines to it.

Chair Lawrence inquired if there was any way to do the landscaping or at least the fence first and help protect the neighbors or shelter them from the construction.

Ms. Block Sanford advised the commissioners that was typically the last thing that goes in and it's also seasonal. You want to wait until the planting season is right. The clearing would happen, then the regrading, the construction, and then typically the last thing to happen would be the planting. They could look at the fence to go in perhaps ahead of the planting but it would most likely have to be after construction.

Mr. Baskin added the magnitude of construction would require that it be towards the end. On the positive side, this was a plan on a very expedited track to complete construction. Once started, it would move very quickly and certainly BJ's had a self-interest in having the landscaping take hold and do well and having the fence provide the protection it's supposed to because they don't want to be going back and replacing it repeatedly. While he appreciated the concern and understood it, he thought the saving grace would be it would happen very quickly.

Chair Lawrence submitted given the fence would go in on the back end, what did Mr. Baskin think about getting a BZA variance. If BJ's couldn't get it, they would go with the plans they had; but if they could get it, it's on the back end and they could make the fence higher and the neighbors a little happier. That way BJ's was not being held up but taking an extra step which was more good faith.

Mr. Baskin replied that from a legal standpoint he was not sure there was any justification that would support a variance to vary the ordinance in that regard. The standards to obtain a variance were very strict and very high and basically as the law existed right now you have to prove that your property basically would be unusable without the variance. A fence wasn't going to make that standard. So

requiring them to go through that process would really not result in any benefit to anyone. He believed it would be a legally unsupportable variance.

Ms. Cotellessa added maybe they would be willing to explore the potential in some areas perhaps to do a short one foot berm and then put the fence within the one foot berm to give additional height where the fence would be 7 feet but they would get a little height. Mr. Baskin pointed out that one potential pitfall of that was if you raise the ground, that affects the timing of the project and the timing was one of the most sensitive elements of this project.

Mr. Wodiska wondered what the plan was for the temporary fencing. Ms. Karen Steen of Walter Phillips said there would be a fence around the property to serve as a tree protection fence and a super silt fence which would be 6 foot chain link fence with that black super silt material along the bottom to keep sediment from going on adjacent properties. The site would be surrounded with that. It would be a secure fence and keep the neighborhood safe from traffic flow both in and out.

Mr. Baskin remarked that as to grading a berm, so far all sides have experienced a very good track record working together and BJ's was certainly willing to work with staff on construction issues of whatever nature to see if they could make things better and provided that assurance.

Chair Lawrence thought Mr. Baskin made it clear they were doing this by right but BJ's was going out of its way trying to be helpful and flexible. He expressed his appreciation and that the Planning Commission was trying to push to get as much as they could for the neighborhood.

Mr. Meeks requested further clarification regarding the fence and specifically that it would definitely run the entire length of the site.

Ms. Block Sanford pointed out what was shown currently in the site plan was a 6 foot fence just behind the loading area. What staff was recommending was that the fence be extended for the entire rear and eastern side, to come around the corner, and it be extended to 7 feet if it's within the rear yard or 8, if there was that opportunity outside of it. What was shown on the site plan that the commissioners had was just a 6 foot privacy fence for just a small portion to screen some of the residents from the loading area.

Mr. Meeks asked if Item 2 was compatible with the storm sewer maintenance requirement and would there be any circumstance where that could become an issue. Ms. Block Sanford didn't believe so. What staff would be looking for in the detail of the fence was if there was a section that had to be removed for access for any kind of storm drain. They were leaving this flexible so when they see the final design in the next site plan, there would be leeway to make some modifications to it. They were looking for a solid fence the entire rear of the site.

In response to Mr. Meeks' inquiry, Mr. Baskin affirmed the tenant, BJ's, would maintain the fence, which would enable the City to access that facility, if needed. BJ's would also maintain the landscape buffer.

Mr. Meeks inquired of staff what ability did the City have to control that other than the site plan compliance issues. Ms. Block Sanford replied it was precisely the site plan compliance issue, which was a very strong mechanism.

MINUTES OF THE 20 APRIL 2009 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED 18 MAY 2009

Ms. Rodger's question was since staff had not seen the design of this fence, how could the Planning Commission approve the site plan if they didn't have all the components of the site plan.

Ms. Block Sanford noted this was fairly typical, that a site plan was approved by the Planning Commission with some outstanding items. It's up to staff, if the Planning Commission chooses to give staff that authority which is what staff was recommending, to approve the remaining items. One of the things they would be looking at was the fence to meet the requirements that was spelled out in Number 2; for instance, talking about the fence. Then it would be approved administratively.

Ms. Rodgers thought the words she had been hearing were "recommending" not "requiring." She asked if they could make this fence as a condition of the site plan approval.

Ms. Block Sanford's reply was that was exactly what they were asking the Planning Commission to do: As part of their motion, to say they recommend approval contingent upon the 23 items in the staff report that were listed, to be shown in the final site plan and would be approved administratively by staff.

Ms. Rodgers asked if the fence wasn't put in, staff wouldn't approve it administratively, which Ms. Block Sanford confirmed. They were putting staff recommendations to the Planning Commission in hopes when the commissioners made their motion, they would say that part of the approval was contingent upon these 23 things that staff had recommended and the Planning Commission make them requirements.

Mr. Baskin noted BJ's had committed to do over 500 feet of fence, which Ms. Rodgers acknowledged; she just didn't want anything to fall through the cracks later on.

Ms. Block Sanford, upon inquiry from Mr. Wodiska regarding the 23 items, explained staff was recommending that the Planning Commission make all 23 a requirement. It was up to the Planning Commission to say, for example, they didn't support number ten, and say it's 22 instead of 23. Staff was recommending all 23 issues listed, plus the construction plan which could be the 24th item, be part of the site plan approval; that the approval be contingent upon the applicant meeting those requirements. When the final site plan was received, staff would be looking to make sure the site plan met all of the requirements. If not, they would not approve it administratively.

Mr. Baskin thought it might be important to sharpen the focus on those two items and one was the fence. The staff's recommendation was that BJ's do a 7 foot fence made out of wood or a wood composite. BJ's had agreed to do a 7 foot fence along the entire rear and around the side, wrapping the corner where the single family homes abut the BJ's site. BJ's objects to having to do it in a wood or wood composite for maintenance reasons. The only real issue with the fence in question was what was going to be the material used. He didn't think that the single issue of what the material was going to be was one of sufficient gravity that should hold up the Planning Commission's approval or disapproval of this site.

He hoped the commission would express the view that what BJ's proposed was acceptable.

MINUTES OF THE 20 APRIL 2009 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED 18 MAY 2009

With respect to the location of the walkway, Mr. Baskin related both sides agree that there would be a walkway, it's just a question of the location. BJ's proposed location is towards the eastern end of the site that aligns with the traffic signal and the crosswalk across Wilson Boulevard and goes directly in the shortest line possible to the front door of the store. The path that had been suggested by staff was one that would, if you cross Wilson at the crosswalk, you have to go south on Wilson Boulevard to the middle of the site, then walk through the parking lots on the path to the middle of the store, and then walk back north again to the end of the store where the entrance was.

Mr. Baskin believed BJ's proposal was one that was going to be more likely used by the pedestrians who frequent the store.

Ms. Cotellessa wished to point out besides those two items, the rest of the items were all minor site plan changes that BJ's had agreed to make that involved making some changes on the drawing when submitted for final approval. She agreed those could be put to bed.

Ms. Cotellessa submitted there was actually a third issue with the pedestrian walkway that wasn't discussed. What BJ's was proposing to do was a pedestrian walkway that goes from Wilson Boulevard with a straight shot to the opening of the store. That seemed very logical. The EDA liked it and the AAB liked it and the applicant thought it's the right way to go. Ms. Cotellessa said staff had expressed concern if cars were coming in right as the pedestrians first start to cross, when they come in they're trying to turn in various places. Staff thought a third option was to put the opening where there was more of an opportunity for the cars to cue and look and see pedestrians as they're coming in. If they had to decide to go in or come all the way down, there may be a cuing issue.

The original thought was bring them in and run them down in the middle. As a practical viewpoint, Ms. Cotellessa acknowledged in big box stores people wing across the parking lot towards that entrance. She was afraid that the proposed location would be putting people in harm's way. Whether there was a pedestrian walkway at all, at whatever location, those were all on the commissioners' plates and staff wanted to provide all the background.

Chair Lawrence asked for Mr. Baskin's reaction to the idea of putting the pathway down the middle row of parking.

Mr. Baskin thought part of the problem with that was they were providing interparcel access to the parcels on both sides of this for future development. It was something the City had asked for. BJ's had done that and lined it up to match their travel lanes and it would really make that less desirable in creating interparcel access. It would provide more limitations on future redevelopment of the site, if you have the interparcel access coming through the middle of the site.

Mr. Baskin noted the BJ's has proposed the striping will be where pedestrians can see it and that motorists can see it. In his experiences, most people are fairly careful, they know to look out for cars in areas where there are cars and automobiles know to look out for pedestrians. He didn't think there was a great deal of difference from a safety standpoint in the two proposals and he thought theirs was the better proposal, particularly in terms of long term development or

redevelopment of the site and the interparcel access they were providing.

Chair Lawrence didn't understand how that helped interparcel access. Ms. Block Sanford explained there were two easements shown on the site, one on the east side and one on the west side of the property. In the future if the sites on either side were to redevelop, there would be these easements to allow for better interparcel access. What staff was looking for was either the relocation of that drive aisle to facilitate the walkway as they've shown it or to relocate the walkway and keep the drive aisle as shown.

Mr. Peter Hopley from BJ's asked to express a few viewpoints on that topic. He thought it was clear to everybody that BJ's would be improving the site through landscaping and through good planning of the parking lot. They've tried to go the extra mile to accommodate everyone's wishes, needs, and desires, knowing full well that not everyone would leave the room completely happy. He thought it was important to speak because those were very important issues to BJ's. The nature of BJ's business was such that the reality was that people come to the store via vehicles. There were not many pedestrians that come to their buildings. He submitted this would be a nice site, well landscaped, and they certainly were going to invite people walking along Wilson Boulevard to come in and hopefully become members. He felt very strongly about the fact that the shortest distance between two points was a straight line and that people would walk on that straight line. Therefore, if everyone agreed to that, they needed to do whatever they could to make sure in doing so pedestrians were as safe as possible.

He wanted to go back to Ms. Block Sanford's and Ms. Cotellessa's comment about extending the driveway and providing a left turn 80 feet to the north. In the many parking lots Mr. Hopley's been involved with in design, he didn't believe that was a good design. It disrupted the flow of cars. There were islands strategically placed so one would not be likely to get the racing through in the parking lot that you do in big box retail developments where you have massive, extensive pavement. To bring that left turn in and then require an immediate additional left or right turn was not an option that he was very comfortable with.

Mr. Hopley believed if the objective tonight was to get the people who would walk to this site, albeit few in number, that they ought to do it in a way to predict as well as they could which way they'll walk and to provide safe access for them. He believed the plan reflected appropriate signage warning there was a crosswalk. Pedestrians would be warned there was a crosswalk. He appreciated and thanked the commission members for listening to him. He respectfully believed it was a more prudent approach to this issue than what staff recommended.

Ms. Hockenberry opined it should be made as safe as possible, a direct line, and she thought BJ's would probably get more pedestrians than what they thought because of the location of the project. She saw it as a straight line to the entrance and that nobody would walk around a different way. She could see staff's reasoning but felt it was also arbitrary and people wouldn't do that.

Chair Lawrence expressed concern with the fact that people would be stopping cars as they were trying to make the light coming in. The cars would try to get in quickly and that would put pedestrians at risk or they would stop and back up traffic. This was why the idea of moving the pedestrian walkway down in the middle appealed to Chair Lawrence. He thought people would take the direct route

MINUTES OF THE 20 APRIL 2009 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION

APPROVED 18 MAY 2009

regardless.

Mr. Meeks suggested since the Planning Commission had heard a lot about the good relationship between the developer and BJ's and City staff, he felt absolutely confident they would work this out.

Chair Lawrence agreed but they were also asking for direction from the Planning Commission as to which way they should go since they were saying this would be a requirement for their final approval.

Ms. Teates said she would rather have a pedestrian walkway than not have one. Having watched people walk across Route 50 unsafely, she knew they were going to go straight, no matter what. If that was the configuration the turn had to be, she wanted to make sure there were lots of marking and that the pedestrians themselves maybe even had a small stop sign to tell them to stop.

Mr. Hopley agreed with that assessment and said he would work with staff to determine what was appropriate for markings and the more the better, if that was everybody's opinion.

Chair Lawrence inquired if wood composite took more maintenance than vinyl. Mr. Hopley wasn't sure it would take more maintenance. He was most concerned they do the least amount of maintenance to that fence because that was in the best interest of the neighbors. While BJ's was a small company relatively speaking, they were still a corporation and there was a process by which things got repaired and he didn't want to think that if a section of that fence were down for any lengthy period of time, there might be an objection by the neighbors. He personally thought the vinyl was the way to go.

If that was not agreeable, he would prefer to do a wood fence as opposed to a composite wood fence because he didn't know whether or not it was a readily available material, how it functioned, and the cost.

Mr. Hopley provided a sample for the commissioners to look at. He submitted it was a quality material and at a distance most people would be hard pressed to determine if it was vinyl or any other type of material. In the event it was defaced, for example, it could be easily cleaned. This fence also would be the furthest away from the neighbors' lot line. Mr. Hopley agreed with Ms. Teates' assessment that there would be a need to have a locked gate there for access to that area.

MOTION: Ms. Hockenberry moved, and Ms. Teates seconded, that the Planning Commission approve subdivision 20090057 with the condition that the Planning Director may grant final administrative approval upon resolution of the items listed in the staff report that pertain to the subdivision.

Upon roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

MOTION: Ms. Hockenberry moved, and Ms. Rodgers seconded, that the Planning Commission approve Site Plan 20090057 with the condition that the Planning

Director may grant final administrative approval upon resolution of the 23 items listed in the Staff Report including modifications of separate construction plan, notification of the neighbors, and consulting with the animal control officer of the Falls Church City Police Department; with the additional modifications that Item 2 be a vinyl fence being 7 foot and covering the fence along the entire rear of the site including the corner around with the additional property owners; and that the pedestrian walkway, Item One, be located as indicated in the proposed plan by the developer.

Chair Lawrence asked if Number 2, by specifically saying 7 feet, if that prevented from getting 8 feet where possible.

Ms. Cotellessa said there was a motion that said 7 feet and if it was meant to say 7 or 8 feet, where possible, that was fine; otherwise 7 feet is what they would do.

Ms. Hockenberry was all right with the 7 feet and was willing to change it to 7 or 8 feet where possible, within Code.

Ms. Rodgers was willing to second that.

Upon roll call vote, the motion passed unanimously.

9. OTHER BUSINESS: None.

10. APPROVAL OF MINUTES: March 16, 2009.

Ms. Rodgers moved, and Mr. Meeks seconded, to approve the minutes of March 16, 2009, as submitted.

Upon voice vote, the motion passed unanimously. (Mr. Wodiska abstained.)

11. ADJOURNMENT:

Ms. Teates moved, and Mr. Meeks seconded, to adjourn the meeting at 9:52 p.m. Immediately following the meeting, the Planning Commission met in a worksession to discuss Application 20081039, Conditional Rezoning (T-1 to B-1), 120 North Lee Street/609 Park Avenue.

Respectfully Submitted,

Noted and Approved:

Ann Hieber
Recording Secretary

Suzanne Cotellessa, AICP
Planning Director

The City of Falls Church is committed to the letter and to the spirit of the Americans with Disabilities Act. This document will be made available in an alternate format upon request. Call 703.248.5040 (TTY 711).

MINUTES OF THE 20 APRIL 2009 MEETING OF THE PLANNING COMMISSION
APPROVED 18 MAY 2009

Page 21